

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-17, and 26-35 are pending. Claim 1 has been amended, and claims 26-35 have been added. Reexamination and reconsideration of the present application are respectfully requested.

In the October 15, 2003 Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1 and 4-17. The Examiner rejected claims 1, 4, 5, 15, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,147,889 to Andrews ("the Andrews reference"). The Examiner rejected claims 1, 5, 15, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,376,907 to Takano ("the Takano reference"). The Examiner rejected claims 6-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over the Takano reference in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,469,381 to Houle et al. ("the Houle reference"). The Examiner rejected claims 10-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over the Takano reference in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,931,222 to Toy et al. ("the Toy reference"). The Examiner rejected claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over the Takano reference in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,617,683 to Lebonheur et al. ("the Lebonheur reference"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The present invention is directed to an integrated heat spreader that is constructed and arranged to be adhesively affixed, with a sealant, to at least a portion of a component, such as a substrate. Claim 1 has been amended to recite the limitation that the heat spreader has a plurality of step portions *perpendicular* to the lip portion. Specifically, independent claim 1 now recites:

An Integrated heat spreader constructed and arranged to be adhesively affixed, with a sealant, to at least a portion of a component, comprising:

a body portion;

a solid continuous lip portion substantially vertically oriented relative to the body portion; and

a plurality of step portions *perpendicular* to the lip portion, wherein the plurality of step portions are spaced apart by a plurality of cutouts.

In the Examiner's Final Office Action dated October 15, 2003, the Examiner stated that claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the Andrews reference. The Andrews reference discloses a integrated heat spreader that has a plurality of flanges that extend from the a base.

The Andrews reference does not teach, suggest, or disclose the method of independent claim 1, as amended. Unlike independent claim 1, the Andrews reference does not make any mention of

a plurality of step portions *perpendicular* to the lip portion, wherein the plurality of step portions are spaced apart by a plurality of cutouts.

The flanges that appear in Figure 3 of the Andrews reference are not perpendicular. They are at an angle relative to the lip, but that angle is not perpendicular.

Similarly, the Houle, Toy, and Takano references do not make up for the deficiencies of the Andrew reference. Thus, the Applicants believe independent claim 1 and the claims that depend therefrom are allowable.

Claims 4-17 all depend, directly or indirectly, from independent claim 1, as amended. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 4-17 distinguish over the above-cited references for the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claims 1, as amended.

Additionally, new independent claim 26 has been added. New independent claim 26 recites the same limitations as independent claim 1, but adds the limitation that the plurality of step portions are spaced apart by a plurality of cutouts *and there are at least five cutouts.*

Neither the Andrews reference, nor any of the other cited references, teach suggest or disclose that the step portions are *perpendicular* to the lip portion *and that there are at least five cutouts* in the integrated heat spreader. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 26, and claims 27-35 which all depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 26, distinguish over the cited references and are allowable.

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///


Applicants believe that the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance, and a favorable action is respectfully requested. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles telephone number (213) 488-7100 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance should the Examiner believe that such a telephone conference would advance prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

PILLSBURY WINTHROP LLP

Date: January 15, 2003

By:


Roger R. Wise
Registration No. 31,204
Attorney For Applicants

725 South Figueroa Street, Suite 2800
Los Angeles, CA 90017-5406
Telephone: (213) 488-7100
Facsimile: (213) 629-1033